

## **REMARKS**

### **Specification**

The Examiner has reminded Applicant of the proper content of an abstract. Applicants believe that the abstract appropriately provides a concise statement of the organization and operation of the user interface of the present invention. However, Applicants are happy to consider any specific amendments that the Examiner thinks necessary.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph on grounds that the claim feature “the mark-up file” lacks antecedent basis. Applicant has amended Claim 14. Therefore, Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-7, 11-12, 17-21, 24-25, 30-35, and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Khan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,360,236), hereinafter Khan. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “an ordering unit, users placing document orders through said ordering unit.” The Examiner asserts that Kahn teaches this feature at col. 6, lines 6-8. See Office Action, page 3. Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. The referenced section of Kahn teaches a user interacting with the disclosed computer product in order to “access a particular file” associated with a project. However, obtaining access to a particular file

as disclosed by Kahn is substantially different from the “ordering unit, users placing document orders through said ordering unit” feature of the present invention. Generally, Kahn is directed to a system which allows multiple developers to simultaneously display documents that the developers are jointly developing, to simultaneously display changes made to the documents, and to simultaneously display a history of changes made to the documents. (See Kahn, column 2, lines 41-45.) In this respect, Kahn discloses submitting a request to access (i.e. open) a particular document by retrieving it from a storage device. In contrast, the present invention enables a user to place a document order through the ordering unit. In this respect, the user is not seeking to open a particular document by retrieving it from storage, but instead placing a document order; the result of which will lead to documents being generated. For at least this reason, Claim 1 is believed allowable. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim 2 depends from Claim 1 and includes the features disclosed therein. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn. Further, Claim 2 recites “an interactive publisher, users placing document orders interactively through said interactive publisher.” The Examiner asserts that Kahn discloses this feature at col. 6, lines 6-8. See Office Action, page 3. Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. First, as set forth above, Kahn does not disclose “users placing document orders.” Further, the citation relied upon by the Examiner further describes the process for obtaining access to a particular file. As set out in Kahn, the user double clicks a mouse in order to select an existing project. Once selected, the system provides a list of folders and files associated with the project. The user then has the option of selecting one of the files to view and or edit. In this respect, Kahn is merely describing the process for traversing a nested file directory. In contrast,

the present invention recites “an interactive publisher, users placing document orders interactively through said interactive publisher.” This interactive publisher queries the user to enter variable data that is required to complete the document order. See Specification, paragraph 40. In this respect, an interactive publisher, users placing document orders interactively through said interactive publisher is quite different from using a mouse to traverse a nested file directory. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants believe that Claim 2 is allowable. Applicants therefore request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 3-5 are rejected as being anticipated by Kahn. However, the Examiner has not identified where Kahn allegedly discloses the features of each of these Claims. Upon reviewing Kahn, neither it nor any of the other cited references, alone or in combination teach or render obvious the features of Claims 3-5. Further, Claim 4 depends from Claim 3, which depends from Claims 2. Consequently, Claims 3 and 4 each include the features recited in Claim 2. As set forth above, Kahn neither alone, nor in combination, teaches or renders obvious these features. Further, Claim 2 and Claim 5 each depend from Claim 1. Consequently, Claims 3, 4, and 5 also include the features recited in Claim 1. As set forth above, Kahn neither alone, nor in combination, teaches or renders obvious these features. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claims 3, 4, and 5 are believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With further regard to Claim 5, Kahn, taken alone or in combination, does not disclose or render obvious, *inter alia*, “search and impact analysis interface, users searching for components, documents, and previously published documents through said search and impact analysis interface; and a rules loading and configuration interface, business layer names and rules being loaded through said rules loading and configuration interface.” Therefore, for at least this

reason, this claim is believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 6-7 each depend from Claim 5 which depends from Claim 1 and therefore include the features recited therein. Thus, for at least this reason, these claims are believed allowable. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 11 depends from Claims 1, 5, and 7 and includes the features recited therein. Therefore, for at least this reason, this claim is believed allowable. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 12 depends from Claims 1, 5, 7, and 11 and includes the features recited therein. Therefore, for at least this reason, this claim is believed allowable. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, “ordering means for placing document orders.” The Examiner has asserted that Kahn discloses this feature at col. 6, lines 6-8. Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. As set forth above with respect to Claim 1, Kahn discloses means for submitting a request to access (i.e. open) a particular document by retrieving it from a storage device. In contrast, the present invention recites “ordering means for placing document orders.” The claimed ordering means enables a user to place a document order for a document to be generated. Kahn, neither alone, nor in combination teaches or renders obvious this feature. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim 18 depends from Claim 17 and includes the features disclosed therein. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn. Further, Claim 18 recites “publishing means for publishing document orders

interactively.” The Examiner asserts that Kahn discloses this feature at col. 6, lines 6-8. See Office Action, page 3. Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. First, as set forth above with respect to Claim 17, Kahn does not disclose “ordering means for placing document orders” Further, the citation relied upon by the Examiner further describes means for obtaining access to a particular file. Again, Kahn is merely describing the means for traversing a nested file directory. In contrast, the present invention recites “publishing means for publishing document orders interactively.” The publishing means enables the user to enter variable data that is required to complete the document order. See Specification, paragraph 40. In this respect, publishing means for publishing document orders interactively is quite different from using a mouse to traverse a nested file directory. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants believe that Claim 18 is allowable. Applicants therefore request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 19-21 are rejected as being anticipated by Kahn. However, the Examiner has not identified where Kahn allegedly discloses the features of each of these Claims. Upon reviewing Kahn, neither it nor any of the other cited references, alone or in combination teach or render obvious the features of Claims 19-21. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 24 depends from Claims 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 and includes the features recited therein. Therefore, for at least this reason, this claim is believed allowable. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 25 depends from Claim 24 which depends from Claims 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 and includes the features recited therein. Therefore, for at least this reason, this claim is believed

allowable. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 30 recites, *inter alia*, “computer program code means for receiving document orders.” The Examiner has asserted that Kahn discloses this feature at col. 6, lines 6-8. Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. As set forth above with respect to Claims 1 and 17, Kahn discloses submitting a request to access (i.e. open) a particular document by retrieving it from a storage device and means therefore. In contrast, the present invention recites “computer program code means for receiving document orders.” The claimed computer program code means enables receipt of a document order identifying a document to be generated. Receiving document orders and receiving a request to access or open a document for viewing are substantially different. Kahn, neither alone, nor in combination teaches or renders obvious computer program means for receiving document orders. Therefore, for at least this reason, this claim is believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim 31 depends from Claim 30 and includes the features recited therein. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn. Further, Claim 31 recites “computer program code means for publishing document orders interactively.” The Examiner asserts that Kahn discloses this feature at col. 6, lines 6-8. See Office Action, page 3. Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion. First, as set forth above with respect to Claims 1 and 17, Kahn does not disclose “placing document orders.” Further, the citation relied upon by the Examiner further describes obtaining access to a particular file and means therefore. Again, Kahn is merely describing traversing a nested file directory. In contrast, the present invention recites “computer program code means for



publishing document orders interactively.” The computer program code means enables the user to enter variable data that is required to complete the document publishing order. See Specification, paragraph 40. In this respect, computer program code means for publishing document orders interactively is quite different from means for traversing a nested file directory. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants believe that Claim 31 is allowable. Applicants therefore request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 32-34 are rejected as being anticipated by Kahn. However, the Examiner has not identified where Kahn allegedly discloses the features of each of these Claims. Upon reviewing Kahn, neither it nor any of the other cited references, alone or in combination teach or render obvious the features of Claims 32-34. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 35 depends from Claims 30-34 and includes the features recited therein. Therefore, for at least this reason, this claim is believed allowable. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 37-39 as being anticipated by Kahn. Applicants wish to point out that Claims 37-39 each depend from Claim 36 and therefore include the features recited therein. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Kahn does not disclose “wherein the computer program code means for managing assigned documents and document components comprises: computer program code means for checking assigned documents and document components in and out; and computer program code means for approving or rejecting documents and components and passing approved or rejected said documents along to an appropriate stage in the workflow process.” See Office Action, page 6. Therefore, for at least this reason, these

claims are believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 37-39 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 8-10, 22, 23, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan and Dabney et al (US Patent No. 6,643,663) hereinafter Dabney.

Claim 8, depends from Claims 5 and 7 and includes the features recited therein. As discussed above with respect to Claim 5, Kahn does not disclose “search and impact analysis interface, users searching for components, documents, and previously published documents through said search and impact analysis interface; and a rules loading and configuration interface, business layer names and rules being loaded through said rules loading and configuration interface. Dabney also fails to disclose these features. Thus, neither Kahn nor Dabney, taken alone or in combination, disclose or render obvious each of the features of Claim 8. Therefore, for at least this reason, this claim is believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from Claim 8 and recite the features therein. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth with respect to Claim 8, these claims are believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 22 and 23 depend from Claims 17-21 and include the features recited therein. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claims 17 and 18, these claims are believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.



Claim 36 depends from claims 30-35 and includes the features recited therein. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claims 30 and 31, these claims are believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 13-15, 26-28, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan, Dabney, and Siefert (U.S. Patent No. 5,721,906) hereinafter Siefert.

Claims 13-15 depend from Claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, these claims are believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 26-28 depend from Claims 17-21. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, these claims are believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 40 depends from Claims 30-36, and 39 and includes the features recited therein. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, this claim is believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 16, 29, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan, Dabney, Siefert, and Okita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,225,998) hereinafter Okita.

Claim 16 depends from Claim 1 and includes the features recited therein. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1, this claim is believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 29 depends from Claim 17 and includes the features recited therein. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, this claim is believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 41 depends from Claim 30 and includes the features recited therein. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, this claim is believed allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection of this claim be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below. For these reasons, the amended claims presented herein are in condition for allowance and a notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing 584182000200.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 9, 2004

By: W. Brian Edge  
W. Brian Edge  
Registration No. 51,642  
Morrison & Foerster LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
Telephone: (202) 887-8769  
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777